

**REMARKS/AGRUMENTS**

***Pending Claims***

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Of these claims, Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

***Summary of the Office Action***

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0102362) [hereinafter “Price”] in view of Harper (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0143642) [hereinafter “Harper”].

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price and Harper as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Meade, II et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0140966).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price and Harper as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Hayward et al. (U.S. Patent 6,629,134).

Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price and Harper as applied to claim 1, and further in view of DeMaria (“Rendezvous of the LAN side”).

Claims 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0102362) in view of Harper (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0143642).

Claim 16 was rejected over Price and Harper, and further in view of Meade II.

Claim 19 was rejected over Price and Harper, and further in view of Hayward.

Claims 21-24 were rejected over Price and Harper, and further in view of DeMaria.

***Traversal of Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)***

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1 - 24, under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Turning to the specific claim language of the present invention, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a method for using real-time communications to obtain products and/or services comprising launching a real-time chat application on a client device, logging into the real-time chat application, wherein logging into the real-time chat application initiates a device discovery operation on the client device, displaying peripheral devices connected to the client device detected by the device discovery operation, selecting a peripheral device from the detected peripheral devices, displaying products and/or services for the selected peripheral device, and obtaining products and/or services for the selected peripheral device.

The present invention describes a method for obtaining products and/or services for peripheral devices connected to a client device by discovering the peripheral devices

connected to the client device and then displaying the products and/or services for a particular peripheral device upon selection of that device from within a real-time chat application.

Applicant respectfully submits that Price and Harper, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least the above-noted feature of the present invention of initiating a device discovery operation upon logging into the real-time chat application.

Price is seen to describe a method and system for communicating with computer system peripheral devices, wherein Instant Messaging software is embedded within a peripheral device. The peripheral device uses the embedded software to communicate with a computer system responsive to an event. More specifically, the peripheral device uses the embedded software to send out Instant Messaging messages responsive to a status of the peripheral device or an event. In addition, the peripheral device receives and processes Instant Messaging messages from a user, application program, or other device, and responsively takes action to the Instant Messaging message.

Price discloses displaying messages on a client device based on the status or event of a peripheral device. Discovery of messages is not the same function as device discovery. Discovery of messages is simply that, discovery of a particular message(s). It cannot be implied from the discovery of messages that a particular device has been discovered. Device discovery on the other hand is the discovery of the existence of a device. Device discovery and discovery of messages are two separate and distinct operations.

While Price is seen to describe displaying messages on a client device based on the status or event of a peripheral device, nothing in Price is seen to even remotely describe any type of device discovery operation nor is anything in Price seen to even remotely describe

displaying peripheral devices discovered via a device discovery operation. As such, Price does not describe at least the foregoing feature of the present invention of initiating a device discovery operation on a client device upon logging into a real-time chat application and displaying peripheral devices connected to the client device detected by the device discovery operation.

.The Office Action also concedes that Price does not expressly disclose obtaining products and/or services for the selected peripheral devices and references. Harper (Abstract and paragraphs 33 and 34) is referenced as making up for this deficiency.

Harper is seen to describe a system for assisting a user in detecting a need to replenish a consumable for a computer peripheral device. The system is able to automatically order consumables for the purpose of replenishing the consumable. Nothing in Harper is seen to even remotely describe performing a device discovery operation. As such, Harper does not describe at least the foregoing feature of the present invention of initiating a device discovery operation upon logging into a real-time chat application and displaying peripheral devices connected to the client device detected by the device discovery operation.

Because neither Price nor Harper disclose or suggest at least the foregoing features of the present invention, Applicant submits that any combination of these references does not render the present invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and indicate that this claim is allowable. In addition, since claim 13 is a system equivalent of claim 1 and was rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable as well.

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116 –Expedited Procedure

Art Unit 3625

Amendment for Application 10/816,681

Amendment Date: 1/22/07

Further Applicant submits that claims 2-12 and 14-24 are allowable for the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1 and 13 respectfully, and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. 103, and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record render obvious the Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 1-24. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while claim features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached at (949) 932-3329. All correspondences should be directed to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sivon Kalminov/  
Sivon Kalminov  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40, 042

CANON U.S.A., Intellectual Property Division  
15975 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA. 92618  
Facsimile: (949) 932-3560